

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1,2 3, 5, 8, 18, and 30-32 have been amended as shown at pages 3-7 of the Reply. Claim 17 has been cancelled. In addition, the specification has been amended as indicated at page 2.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiners Myhre and Traore for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview conducted on March 30, 2007. Examiners were contacted to discuss interpretation of the cited references Garg (US 6,289,458) and Corrigan (US 6,640,097) with respect to claims 3, 8, 16. With regards to masking an object from an entity if the entity did not have permission to access the object, it was agreed that the references did not disclose this feature. However, Examiners indicated they believed that prior art references covering this likely exist. Examiners indicated further clarification of the differentiation was required regarding proxy tenant caller in the arguments. Examiners indicated that they did not believe the cited references disclosed a restricted audience offer or a subscription conversion component.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Objection of Claim 17 Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)**

Claim 17 stands objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Therefore, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**II. Objection of Claim 1**

Claim 1 stands objected to because of the following informalities: the examiner notes the use of acronyms (API) throughout the claim 1 without first including a description in plaintext, as required. Claim 1 has been amended to address this objection. As such, this objection should be withdrawn.

**III. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 9-12 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Garg, *et al.* (US 6,289,458). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Garg, *et al.* does not teach each and every element of the subject invention as recited in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc., v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 U.S.P.Q.2D 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegual Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The subject claims relates to verification of permission for an entity to access objects in multiple entity shared environment. For example, in a subscription and billing system, where multiple tenants have data stored in a shared database, access to data and objects can be restricted such that a first tenant does not have access to data or objects accessible by a second tenant. There may also be objects that both tenants can access. Furthermore, a first tenant can act as a proxy for a second tenant to access an object, such as a particular subscription, not directly accessible by the second entity. In particular, independent claim 1 recites *a system that facilitates access to a plurality of shared software objects by disparate entities, comprising: a platform component that receives a request to access an object by an entity, wherein the entity requests access to an object on behalf of another entity; a data store that stores security information on classes of the objects; and a verification component that employs the security information to verify that the entity has permission to call an Application Programming Interface (API) for the object and/or operate on the object.*

Garg, *et al.* does not teach or suggest the aforementioned novel features as recited in the subject claim. The cited reference discloses a system for managing access rights to objects, as well as, individual or sets of properties or objects within an object. However, the access rights are related to an entity directly accessing an object for themselves. The cited reference is silent regarding an entity requesting access to an object on behalf of another entity as taught in the

subject claim.

In view of the foregoing, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Garg, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all limitations of independent claims 1 (and claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 9-12 that depend there from), and thus fails to anticipate the subject claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Rejection of Claims 18-32 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 18-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Corrigan, *et al.* (US 6,640,097). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Corrigan, *et al.* does not teach each and every element of the subject invention as recited in the subject claims.

Independent claim 18 (and similarly independent claims 31 and 32) recites *storing one or more security options in a database, the security options related to an automated billing and provisioning system, wherein the security options include at least one of a restricted audience offer or conversion of a subscription from a first type to a second type*. The subject claims disclose security options that support restricting certain offers to a particular set of tenants, for example to reward certain loyal customers with special discount. Moreover, the security options can restrict conversion of a subscription from a first type to a second type, for example to prevent one tenant from stealing another tenant's subscriber. As discussed in the telephonic interview, Corrigan, *et al.* is silent regarding these two security options.

Moreover independent claim 30 recites *means for authenticating at least one entity attempting access to an online billing and service, wherein the entity is attempting access on behalf of another entity; means for authorizing the at least one entity; and means for associating a security parameter with at least one business object from a globalized region of a database*. Contrary to assertions in the Office Action, Corrigan, *et al.* fails to disclose this novel feature of the subject claim. The section of the prior art reference cited in the Office Action discloses WAP services platform where the server hosting the service can be located at WAP network operators own domain or another domain. This is merely discussing the location of the server hosting the services that the WAP user is accessing. However, the WAP user is accessing the server hosting the services on their own behalf, not on behalf of another WAP user.

Therefore, Corrigan, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest means for authenticating at least one entity

attempting access to an online billing and service, wherein the entity is attempting access on behalf of another entity.

In view of the foregoing, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Corrigan, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all limitations of independent claims 18 and 30-32 (and claims 19-29 that depend there from), and thus fails to anticipate the subject claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. Rejection of Claims 4, 7, 8 and 13-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 4, 7, 8 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garg, *et al.* in view of Corrigan, *et al.*. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Garg, *et al.* in view of Corrigan, *et al.* does not teach each and every element of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 4, 7, 8 and 13-17 depend from independent claims 1. As discussed above, Garg, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all limitations of independent claim 1. Moreover, as noted *supra* with respect to the similar limitations of claim 30, Corrigan, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest a *platform component that receives a request to access an object by an entity, wherein the entity requests access to an object on behalf of another entity*. Both references teach an entity accessing an object on their own behalf.

Accordingly, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Garg, *et al.* and Corrigan, *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of applicants' invention as recited in independent claim 1 (and claims 4, 7, 8 and 13-17 that depend therefrom), and thus fails to make obvious the subject claimed invention. As such, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP502US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TURCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TURCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731